

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,994	MLINAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(3) _____.

 (2) Andrew Stover (Applicant's attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 July 2004
Time: 3:30 pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
None specifically
Claims discussed:
1-19 and 28-30
Prior art documents discussed:
None specifically
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. Although the examiner had found the arguments with regard to claims 1-19 and 28-30 presented in the response filed on May 27, 2004 persuasive, the examiner stipulated that the term "lengthening" was not fully supported by the applicant's original disclosure and therefore was considered new matter by the examiner. However, the examiner indicated that the term "separating" would be fully supported by the applicant's arguments and would further be commensurate with the applicant's arguments. As such, the examiner proposed replacing the phrase "lengthening at least a portion" with "separating portions" to place the application in condition for allowance. The applicant's attorney approved the proposed amendment and authorized the examiner to proceed with the change via Examiner's Amendment.